REMARKS

Claims 2 and 12-49 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "[a] modified polynucleotide isolated from a microorganism comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected from the group consisting of:

(a) nucleic acid molecules encoding at least the mature form of the polypeptide depicted in SEQ ID NO:3;

(b) nucleic acid molecules comprising the coding sequence as depicted in SEQ ID NO:2;

(c) nucleic acid molecules encoding a polypeptide derived from the polypeptide whose sequence has an identity of 56.3 % or more to the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide encoded by a nucleic acid molecule of (a) or (b); and

(d) nucleic acid molecules comprising a polynucleotide having a sequence of a nucleic acid molecule amplified from *a Phaffia* nucleic acid library using the primers depicted in SEQ ID NO:4, 5, and 6;

wherein the nucleic acid molecule of any one of (c) to (d) encodes a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 1-33; in Examples 1-16; and in original claims 1 and 21-22. *See In re Gardner*, 177 USPQ 396, 397 (CCPA 1973) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and (l) (8th ed. Rev. 5, August 2006, pp. 600-92 and 600-84).

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to recite a "modified" polynucleotide instead of an "isolated" polynucleotide. Claim 3 has also been amended to recite "of

SEQ ID NO: 3" instead of "which is identified by." Claim 4 has also been amended to recite "isolated from" instead of "derived from." These amendments do not change the scope of the claims in any way.

Claims 8, 10, and 11 have been amended to recite "recombinant microorganism" instead of "recombinant organism." Support for this amendment is found in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 7-8; in Examples 1-16; and in original claim 26. *See id.*

Claim 9 has been amended to remove "baculovirus."

Claims 50-55 have been added. Support for these new amendments is found in the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 1-33; page 5, lines 19-34; page 6, lines 8-11; Examples 1-16; and in original claims 1 and 6. *See id.*

It is submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments. Approval and entry of the amendments is respectfully solicited.

Objections:

The Examiner objected to claims 3 and 27 because, according to the Examiner, the phrase "amino acid sequence which is identified by SEQ ID NO: 3" should instead state "the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3." (Paper No. 20060823 at 3).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 27 has been cancelled, and claim 3 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to recite an "amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3." In view of the foregoing amendments, the objection of claims 3 and 27 is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also objected to claim 1, part (d). (*Id.*). With a view towards furthering prosecution, that portion of claim 1, which was objected to by the Examiner, has been cancelled. In view of the foregoing amendment, this objection is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was also objected to because of the phraseology "comprising a nucleic acid molecule one or more selected." (*Id.*). The Examiner suggested instead that the phraseology "comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected."

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's instructions to recite "comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected." In view of the foregoing amendment, this objection of claim 1 is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 10 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserted that claims 10 and 34 recite a "'recombinant organism' which encompasses a transformed human" and "[h]uman beings are non-statutory subject matter." (Paper No. 20060823 at 3).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 34 has been cancelled, and claim 10 has been amended to recite "a recombinant microorganism." In view of the foregoing amendment, the rejection of claims 10 and 34 is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Indefiniteness Rejections:

Claims 4 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. (Paper No. 20060823 at 4).

In making the rejection, the Examiner observed that claims 4 and 28 recite that "said polynucleotide is derived from a strain." The Examiner then asserted that it "is unclear if the term 'derived' includes only the wild type sequence or includes mutants, variants or fragments thereof, which are unknown, thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) indefinite." (*Id.*). The Examiner suggested amending the claims to recite "isolated." (*Id.*)

As suggested by the Examiner, and with a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 4 has been amended to recite "isolated." Claim 28 has been cancelled. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 4 and 28 is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 27-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. (*Id.*).

In making this rejection, the Examiner asserted that independent claims 1 and 2 "recite 'under stringent conditions', but the specification does not define what conditions constitute 'stringent'." (*Id.*).

Initially, we respectfully note that the Examiner's conclusion that the specification does not define "what conditions constitute stringent" is in error. Exemplary high stringency hybridization and wash conditions are clearly disclosed at paras. [0035] and [0036] of the specification:

> [0035] High Stringent Hybridization: 6xSSC, 0.5% SDS, 100 μg/ml denatured salmon sperm DNA, 50% formamide, incubate overnight with gentle rocking at 42° C.
>
> [0036] High Stringent Wash: 1 wash in 2xSSC, 0.5% SDS at room temperature for 15 minutes, followed by another wash in 0.1xSSC, 0.5% SDS at room temperature for 15 minutes.

And, we have presented claim 53, which recites such conditions. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing, claim 53 is in full compliance with all parts of § 112.

With respect to the rejected claims and with a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 2 has been cancelled, and claim 1 has been amended to remove the hybridization language. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 (and dependent claims 3-11 and 27-35) is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 27-35 were also rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. (*Id.*).

In making the rejection, the Examiner observed that independent claims 1 and 2 recite "complementary strand." The Examiner observed that it "is unclear as to whether it [complimentary strand] is limited to the complete complementary strand or includes fragments thereof." (*Id.*).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 2 has been cancelled, and claim 1 has been amended to remove the "complimentary" language. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 (and dependent claims 3-11 and 27-35) is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 33 were also rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. (*Id.* at 5).

In making the rejection, the Examiner observed that claims 9 and 33 recite "'baculovirus' as a host organism." The Examiner then asserted that "[b]aculovirus is virus or a viral vector, not a host organism ...." (*Id.*).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 33 has been cancelled, and claim 9 has been amended to remove the objected to language. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 9 and 33 is rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§112, First Paragraph Rejections:

1. Written Description

Claims 1-11 and 27-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. (Paper No. 20060823 at 5-7). In making the rejection, the Examiner asserted that claims 1-11 and 27-35 "contain[] subject matter, which was not described in specification ...." (*Id.*). The Examiner further asserted that "[t]he specification teaches the structure of only a single representative species of such acetyl-CoA carboxylase gene encoding proteins." (*Id.* at 7). The Examiner also asserted that "the specification fails to describe any other representative species by any identifying characteristics or properties other than the functionality of encoding the polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity." (*Id.*). The Examiner then concluded that "[g]iven this lack of description of representative species encompassed by the genus of DNAs used in the claim, the specification fails to sufficiently describe the claimed invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize that applicants were in possession of the claimed invention." (*Id.*)

Initially, we note that there is a ***strong presumption*** that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present in an application as filed. *See In re Werthheim*, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976); and MPEP §2163(II)(A). Further, an applicant may show possession of the claimed invention by describing it using

descriptive means such as, for example, words, structures, figures, diagrams and formulas. *See* MPEP §2163(I). Moreover, a proper written description analysis requires an analysis of the understanding of an ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of the invention. *See* MPEP § 2163(II)(A)(2); *see also Wang Labs. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 26 USPQ2d 1767, 1774 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied by sufficient description of a ***representative number of species***. *See Regents of University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997); and MPEP § 2163 (II)(A)(3)(a)(ii). In fact, there are situations where even one species can adequately support a genus. *See Rasmussen,* 211 USPQ 323, 326-27 (CCPA 1981).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, however, claim 1 has been amended to recite "[a] modified polynucleotide isolated from a microorganism comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected from the group consisting of:

(a) nucleic acid molecules encoding at least the mature form of the polypeptide depicted in SEQ ID NO:3;

(b) nucleic acid molecules comprising the coding sequence as depicted in SEQ ID NO:2;

(c) nucleic acid molecules encoding a polypeptide derived from the polypeptide whose sequence has an identity of 56.3 % or more to the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide encoded by a nucleic acid molecule of (a) or (b); and

(d) nucleic acid molecules comprising a polynucleotide having a sequence of a nucleic acid molecule amplified from *a Phaffia* nucleic acid library using the primers depicted in SEQ ID NO:4, 5, and 6;

wherein the nucleic acid molecule of any one of (c) to (d) encodes a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide." And, claims 2 and 27-35 have been cancelled.

As amended, claim 1 recites ***specific nucleic acid molecules,*** namely parts (a) and (b), which the Examiner conceded are described. Moreover, parts (c) and (d) of claim 1, as amended, are specifically tied to a recited function, namely that the recited nucleic acid molecules encode "a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide." Support for these amendments is found virtually *in haec verba* in the specification. (*See, e.g.,* Specification page 2, lines 1-33; Examples 1-16; and original claims 1 and 21-22). Accordingly, the nucleic acid molecules recited in parts (c) and (d) of claim 1 are specifically tied to a function. Thus, there is a built-in tie between the recited structures and functions. Moreover, the specification exemplifies a number of ways to confirm ACC function. (*See, e.g.*, para. [0083] and Example 16). Nothing more need be provided. Thus, in view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims fully satisfy the written description requirement.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

2. Enablement

Claims 1-11 and 27-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. (Paper No. 20060823 at 8). In making the rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that the specification is "enabling for an acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) gene of SEQ ID NO: 2 encoding protein of SEQ ID NO: 3 P. rhodozyma ...." (*Id.*)

The Examiner, however, asserted that "[t]he scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of ACC gene encoding protein broadly encompassed by the claims." (*Id.* at 10).

Initially, we note it is the Examiner's burden to demonstrate that a specification is not sufficiently enabling. *In re Marzocchi*, 169 USPQ 367, 369 (CCPA 1971). To carry his/her burden, the Examiner must identify and clearly articulate the factual bases and supporting evidence that allegedly establish that undue experimentation would be required to carry out the claimed invention. *Id.* at 370. It is well established that claims must be separately analyzed. *Ex parte Jochim*, 11 USPQ2d 561 (BPAI 1988).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to recite "[a] modified polynucleotide isolated from a microorganism comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected from the group consisting of:

(a) nucleic acid molecules encoding at least the mature form of the polypeptide depicted in SEQ ID NO:3;

(b) nucleic acid molecules comprising the coding sequence as depicted in SEQ ID NO:2;

(c) nucleic acid molecules encoding a polypeptide derived from the polypeptide whose sequence has an identity of 56.3 % or more to the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide encoded by a nucleic acid molecule of (a) or (b); and

(d) nucleic acid molecules comprising a polynucleotide having a sequence of a nucleic acid molecule amplified from *a Phaffia* nucleic acid library using the primers depicted in SEQ ID NO:4, 5, and 6;

wherein the nucleic acid molecule of any one of (c) to (d) encodes a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide." And, claims 2 and 27-35 have been cancelled.

As amended, claim 1 recites ***specific nucleic acid molecules***, namely parts (a) and (b), which the Examiner concedes are enabled. (*Id.* at 8). Moreover, parts (c) and (d) of claim 1, as amended, are specifically tied to a function, namely that the recited nucleic acid molecules encode "a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide." With these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's concerns regarding the scope of claim 1, *i.e.*, "the extremely large number of ACC gene encoding protein broadly encompassed by the claims," is rendered moot. (Paper No. 20060823 at 10).

Moreover, as is well accepted, even a "considerable amount" of experimentation is permissible if it is merely routine or if the specification provides a reasonable amount of guidance. MPEP § 2164.05 and *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ at 1404.

In addition, "a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art." MPEP § 2164.01 (8th ed. Rev. 5, August 2006, p. 2100-187) *citing In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1463, 221 USPQ 481, 489 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In this regard, we note that the specification provides ample disclosure sufficient to inform a skilled artisan that the Applicants enabled the currently claimed polynucleotides. For example, the specification discloses 16 examples and two figures that provide sufficient instruction to one skilled in the art on how to make and use the currently claimed polynucleotides.

The specification also discloses methods for identifying polynucleotides that encode polypeptides that have the function recited in claim 1. For example, the specification, at para. [0083] and Example 16, discloses how to confirm ACC activity. Thus, identifying nucleic acid molecules recited by parts (c) and (d) of claim 1 is a matter of applying the disclosure in the specification of how to make such molecules and running them through the disclosed functional screening assays. It is respectfully submitted that such activity is not undue experimentation.

In particular, the specification discloses that a "nucleic acid molecule encoding an acetyl-CoA carboxylase homologous to a protein with an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 can be created by introducing one or more nucleotide substitutions, additions or deletions into a nucleotide sequence of the polynucleotide of the present invention, in particular of SEQ ID NO:2 such that one or more amino acid

substitutions, additions or deletions are introduced into the encoded protein," and "[m]utations can be introduced into the sequences of, *e.g.*, SEQ ID NO:2 by standard techniques ...." (*See, e.g.,* Specification at page 8, lines 9-12, Examples 1-16, and Fig. 2). Also, Examples 1-16 disclose detailed isolation, cloning, sequencing, and hybridization methods and techniques for the acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) gene. In addition, Figure 2 provides a cloned DNA fragment covering the ACC gene region on the chromosome of *P. rhodozyma.*

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 34 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. (Paper No. 20060823 at 12).

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserted that claims 10 and 34 "are so broad as to encompass any host organism or any host transformed with specific nucleic acids, including cell[s] in *in vitro* culture as well as cells within any multicellular organism." (*Id.*). The Examiner, however, acknowledged that the specification is "enabling for isolated host cells transformed with the recited nucleic acids." (*Id.*).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 34 has been cancelled, and claim 10 has been amended to recite "recombinant microorganism" instead of "recombinant organism." In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been rendered moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1-2, 5-11, and 29-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Schnell *et al.*, WO 1999/32635 ("Schnell"). (Paper No. 20060823 at 13).

For the reasons set forth below, the rejection, has been rendered moot.

Schnell discloses the cloning of an acetyl-COA-carboxylase gene from *Candida albicans*. (Page 1). Schnell also discloses that the coding region of the *Candida albicans* ACC1 gene (SEQ ID NO: 2) is 6810 nucleotides in length and encodes a protein sequence (SEQ ID NO: 3) 2270 amino acids in length. (*Id.*). Schnell further discloses that the *Candida albicans* ACC1 enzyme "may be used in biochemical assays to identify agents which modulate the activity of the enzyme." (Page 4). Schnell also discloses that:

> The enzyme may be used to turn over a convenient substrate whilst incorporating/losing a labelled component to define a test system. Test compounds are then introduced into the test system and measurements made to determine their effect on enzyme activity. Particular assays are those used to identify inhibitors of the enzyme useful as antifungal agents. (*Id.*). The enzyme of the invention, and convenient fragments thereof may be used to raise antibodies. Such antibodies have a number of uses which will be evident to the molecular biologist of ordinary skill. Such uses include (i) monitoring enzyme expression, (ii) the development of assays to measure enzyme activity and precipitation of the enzyme. (*Id.*).

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Schnell "disclose[s] the sequence of a protein of 2233 amino acid residues, which is 54% identical to SEQ ID NO: 3 of the instant application." (Paper No. 20060823 at 13). The Examiner further asserted that "[b]ecause of the recitation of 'having one or more amino acid deletions, substitutions or additions to SEQ ID NO: 2 or one or more amino acid substitution,

deletion and/or additions to the SEQ ID NO: 3' or 'polynucleotide comprising 15 nucleotides of the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 2 or SEQ ID NO: 1' or 'polynucleotide which hybridizes with the complement of SEQ ID NO: 2 or SEQ ID NO: 1 under stringent conditions' render claims very broad and in view of these recitation, a skill artisan would reasonably believe that the polynucleotide encoding the protein of Schnell et al. would hybridize under at least low stringency condition with SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2." (*Id.* at 13-14). The Examiner then concluded that Schnell "anticipate[s]" claims 1-2, 5-11, and 29-35. (*Id.* at 14).

As is well settled, anticipation requires "identity of invention." *Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Mktg. & Supply,* 33 USPQ2d 1496, 1498 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Each and every element recited in a claim must be found in a single ***prior art reference*** and arranged as in the claim. *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978); *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.,* 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir 1984). "Moreover, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to ***identify wherein each and every facet*** of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1462 (BPAI 1990). The Examiner is required to point to the disclosure in the reference "***by page and line***" upon which the claim allegedly reads. *Chiong v. Roland*, 17 USPQ2d 1541, 1543 (BPAI 1990).

With a view towards furthering prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to recite "[a] modified polynucleotide isolated from a microorganism comprising a nucleic acid molecule selected from the group consisting of:

(a) nucleic acid molecules encoding at least the mature form of the polypeptide depicted in SEQ ID NO:3;

(b) nucleic acid molecules comprising the coding sequence as depicted in SEQ ID NO:2;

(c) nucleic acid molecules encoding a polypeptide derived from the polypeptide whose sequence has an identity of 56.3 % or more to the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide encoded by a nucleic acid molecule of (a) or (b); and

(d) nucleic acid molecules comprising a polynucleotide having a sequence of a nucleic acid molecule amplified from *a Phaffia* nucleic acid library using the primers depicted in SEQ ID NO:4, 5, and 6;

wherein the nucleic acid molecule of any one of (a) to (d) encodes a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide." And, claims 2 and 29-35 have been cancelled.

Initially, we note that it is unclear, which "2233" amino acids out of the 2270 amino acids disclosed by Schnell to be the ACC1 polypeptide the Examiner is referring to. Next, we note that all of the claims that are pending and under examination are directed to "nucleic acid molecules" - "not a protein of 2233 amino acids" as asserted in the rejection. We further note that claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a nucleic acid molecule that encodes a polypeptide that is at least 56.3% identical to, e.g., SEQ ID NO: 3, not 54% as asserted in the Office Action.

In view of these clear, unaddressed differences, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action has failed to identify where in Schnell each and every

element of, *e.g.*, claim 1 can be found. Accordingly, for this reason alone, the rejection is deficient and should be withdrawn.

In an effort to further prosecution, claim 1 has also been amended, *inter alia*, to remove old subparts (c), (d), (f), and (h) - (l). Accordingly, the Examiner's unsupported assertion that such recitations would lend one to "believe that the polynucleotide encoding the protein of Schnell et al. would hybridize under at least low stringency condition with SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2" has been rendered moot. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as discussed above, Schnell discloses the cloning of acetyl-COA-carboxylase gene from *Candida albicans* and that the enzyme and fragments thereof may be used in biochemical assays and for the production of antigens. (Page 4). However, contrary to Schnell, certain aspects of some of the claims under examination concern modification of the acetyl-CoA-carboxylase activity in such a manner that the activity is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide. In other words, Schnell fails to disclose "***a polypeptide having acetyl-CoA carboxylase activity which is reduced compared to the activity of the wild type polypeptide***." Therefore, for this additional reason, the rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

The rejection is also devoid of any discussion of the dependent claims separate from the independent claims. Accordingly, the record is devoid of any evidence that the Examiner individually considered the dependent claims. It is axiomatic, however, that a dependent claim is not *per se* unpatentable by a document that allegedly makes unpatentable the base claim. Accordingly, "[e]xaminers are

reminded that a dependent claim is directed to a combination including everything recited in the base claim and what is recited in the dependent claim. ***It is this combination that must be compared with the prior art, exactly as if it were presented as one independent claim.***" MPEP § 608.01(n) (8th ed., Rev. 5, Aug. 2006, pp. 600-91). This the Examiner has not done. Accordingly, the rejection is also both factually and legally deficient as to the dependent claims. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn as to the dependent claims.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, entry of the amendments, withdrawal of the objections and rejections, and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this paper, please contact the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 23, 2007.

Charles M. Avigliano

Charles M. Avigliano, Reg. No. 52,578

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles M. Avigliano

Charles M. Avigliano
Registration No. 52,578
BRYAN CAVE LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
33rd Floor
New York, NY 10104-3300
Phone: (212) 541-2000
Fax: (212) 541-4630